arXiv:1302.3726v1 [cs.DS] 15 Feb 2013

IMPROVED UPPER AND LOWER BOUND TECHNIQUES FOR MONOTONE SWITCHING NETWORKS FOR DIRECTED CONNECTIVITY

AARON POTECHIN
MIT
POTECHIN@MIT.EDU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we extend the work of our previous paper "Bounds on monotone switching networks for directed connectivity" by further analyzing the monotone space complexity of directed connectivity. In particular, we analyze the monotone space compexity of directed connectivity for a variety of input graphs, not just minimal YES-instances. We show that the monotone space complexity of input graphs with a very large number of lollipops (vertices v for which there is an edge from s to v or an edge from v to t) is low by giving a randomized monotone generalization of Savitch's algorithm which uses a parity argument. This gives us upper bounds for both monotone switching networks and monotone circuits. We then give lower bounds on monotone switching networks for directed connectivity which are tight whenever the input graph is acyclic and does not have any vertices v which are connected to a large number of other vertices by short paths.

Acknowledgement:
This material is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. 0645960.

Key words and phrases. L,NL,computational complexity, monotone complexity, space complexity, switching networks.

1. INTRODUCTION

L versus NL, the problem of whether non-determinism helps in logarithmic space bounded computation, is a longstanding open question in computational complexity. At present, only a few results are known. It is known that the problem is equivalent to the question of whether there is a log-space algorithm for the *directed connectivity* problem, namely given an n vertex directed graph G and pair of vertices s, t, find out if there is a directed path from s to t in G. Savitch [18] gave an $O(\log^2 n)$-space deterministic algorithm for directed connectivity, thus proving that $NSPACE(g(n)) \subseteq DSPACE((g(n)^2))$ for every space constructable function g. Immerman [8] and Szelepcsényi [21] independently gave an $O(\log n)$-space non-deterministic algorithm for directed *non-connectivity*, thus proving that $NL = co\text{-}NL$. For the problem of *undirected connectivity* (i.e. where the input graph G is undirected), a probabilistic algorithm was shown using random walks by Aleliunas, Karp, Lipton, Lovász, and Rackoff [1], and Reingold [17] gave a deterministic $O(\log n)$-space algorithm for the same problem, showing that undirected connectivity is in L. Trifonov [22] independently gave an $O(\lg n \lg \lg n)$ algorithm for undirected connectivity.

So far, most of the work trying to show that $L \neq NL$ has been done using the JAG model or the branching program model. The JAG (Jumping Automata on Graphs) model was introduced by Cook and Rackoff [4] as a simple model for which we can prove good lower time and space bounds but which is still powerful enough to simulate most known algorithms for the st-connectivity problem. This implies that if there is an algorithm for st-connectivity breaking these bounds, it must use some new techniques which cannot be captured by the JAG model. Later work in this area has focused on extending this framework to additional algorithms and more powerful variants of the JAG model. Two relatively recent results in this area are the result of Edmonds, Poon, and Achlioptas [5] which shows tight lower bounds for the more powerful NN-JAG (Node-Named Jumping Automata on Graphs) model and the result of Lu, Zhang, Poon, and Cai [11] showing that Reingold's algorithm for undirected connectivity and a few other algorithms for undirected connectivity can all be simulated by the RAM-NNJAG model, a uniform variant of the NNJAG model.

Ironically, the branching program model was originally developed as a way to make more efficient switching networks. In the early 20th century switching networks were used for practical applications, so the research focus was on finding good ways to construct switching networks for various problems. For example, see the pioneering papers of Shannon [19], [20]. Lee [10] developed the branching program model as a way to easily construct switching networks, as if we have a branching program for a problem, we can make a switching network for that problem simply by making all of the edges undirected. Masek [12] showed that the branching program model could be used to show space lower bounds and there has been a lot of research in this direction ever since. For a survey of some of the many results on branching programs, switching networks, and a related model, switching-and-rectifier networks, see Razborov [16].

In Potechin [13], we explored trying to prove $L \neq NL$ using the switching network model. In particular, we used the switching network model to separate monotone analogues of L and NL. While our techniques were very different, this result fit in very well with existing knowledge. Indeed, the separation of the monotone analogues of L and NL in Potechin [13] was proposed as open problem 2 of Gringi and Sipser [6] and was also proposed as open problem 4 of Razborov [16].

In this paper we extend the work of Potechin [13] by using the switching network model to further anaylze the monotone space complexity of directed connectivity. In particular, we analyze the monotone space complexity of directed connectivity for a variety of different input graphs, not just the minimal YES-instances (graphs with just a path from s to t and no other edges). Our motivation for doing this is twofold. First, it is a fascinating question on its own. Second, doing so allows us to hone our techniques for other problems and hopefully for non-monotone analysis. The techniques in Potechin [13] were extended by Chan and Potechin [3] to give monotone space and circuit depth lower bounds for the generation and k-clique problems and the techniques in this paper can almost certainly be extended to other problems as well.

It should be noted that while monotone complexity theory is a very rich field and researchers have had great success in separating different monotone complexity classes, this exploration of the monotone space complexity of particular inputs is very different from most previous work on monotone complexity. Razborov

[16] used an approximation method to show that any monotone circuit solving the k-clique problem on n vertices (determining whether or not there is a set of k pairwise adjacent vertices in a graph on n vertices) when $k = \lceil \frac{\lg n}{4} \rceil$ must have size at least $n^{\Omega(\lg n)}$, thus proving that $mP \neq mNP$. This method was later improved by Alon and Boppana [2] and by Haken [7]. Karchmer and Wigderson [9] showed that any monotone circuit solving undirected connectivity has depth at least $\Omega((\lg n)^2)$, thus proving that undirected connectivity is not in monotone-NC^1 and separating monotone-NC^1 and monotone-NC^2. Raz and McKenzie [14] later separated the entire monotone NC hierarchy, proving that monotone-$NC \neq$ monotone-P and for any i, monotone-$NC^i \neq$ monotone-NC^{i+1}. All of these results were proven by looking only at minimal YES-instances and maximal NO-instances. This paper is one of the first in monotone complexity theory to analyze other YES-insances as well.

1.1. **Definitions.** We recall some key definitions from Potechin [13].

Definition 1.1. *A switching network for directed connectivity on a set of vertices $V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$ with distinguished vertices s,t is a tuple $< G', s', t', \mu' >$ where G' is an undirected multi-graph with distinguished vertices s',t' and μ' is a labeling function giving each edge $e' \in E(G')$ a label of the form $v_1 \to v_2$ or $\neg(v_1 \to v_2)$ for some vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$.*
We say that such a switching network is a switching network for directed connectivity on n vertices, where $n = |V(G)|$, and we take its size to be $n' = |V(G')|$ (where $s', t' \notin V(G')$). A switching network for directed connectivity is monotone if it has no labels of the form $\neg(v_1 \to v_2)$.

Remark 1.2. *We exclude s and t from $V(G)$ because we very often need to refer to all of the vertices of G except s and t. We exclude s' and t' from $V(G')$ for consistency.*

Definition 1.3. *We say a switching network G' for directed connectivity on a set of vertices $V(G)$ accepts an input graph G if there is a path P' in G' from s' to t' such that for each edge $e' \in E(P')$, $\mu'(e')$ is consistent with the input graph G (i.e. of the form e for some edge $e \in E(G)$ or $\neg e$ for some $e \notin E(G)$).*
We say a switching network for directed connectivity is sound if it does not accept any input graphs G on the set of vertices $V(G)$ which do not have a path from s to t.
We say a switching network for directed connectivity is complete if it accepts all input graphs G on the set of vertices $V(G)$ which have a path from s to t.
If G' is a switching network for directed connectivity on a set of vertices $V(G)$, then we say that G' solves directed connectivity on $V(G)$ if G' is both complete and sound.

Definition 1.4. *Given sets I_A, I_R of input graphs on a set $V(G)$ of vertices with distinguished vertices s,t where each graph in I_A contains a path from s to t and each graph in I_R does not contain a path from s to t, let $m(I_A, I_R)$ be the size of the smallest monotone switching network for directed connectivity on $V(G)$ which accepts all of the input graphs in I_A and does not accept any input graph in I_R.*

In this paper, we will always take I_R to be the set of all input graphs which do not contain a path from s to t. In other words, we assume that the switching networks we analyze are sound. In this case, we have the following definition:

Definition 1.5. *Given a set I of input graphs on a set $V(G)$ of vertices with distinguished vertices s,t where each graph in I contains a path from s to t, let $m(I)$ be the size of the smallest sound monotone switching network for directed connectivity on $V(G)$ which accepts all of the input graphs in I.*

Definition 1.6. *Given an input graph G, define $m(G) = m(\{\sigma(G) : \sigma \in S_{V(G)}\})$*

Remark 1.7. *Roughly speaking, $m(G)$ measures the space complexity of solving directed connectivity on the input graph G.*

1.2. **Our results.** For our upper bounds, we give a randomized monotone generalization of Savitch's algorithm which uses a parity argument. This gives us upper bounds for both monotone switching networks and monotone circuits (We consider both because it is not clear what the most natural definition of monotone-L is. For details, see Gringi and Sipser [6] and Section 8 of Potechin [13]).

Theorem 1.8. *There is a monotone circuit of size at most $2^{O(\lg n+\lg l\lg k)}$ and width $O(\lg n+\lg l\lg k)$ which is sound and solves directed connectivity on all input graphs G where all but k of the vertices in $V(G)$ are lollipops and there is a path from s to t of length l in G.*

Theorem 1.9. *There is a monotone switching network of size at most $2^{O(\lg n+\lg l\lg k)}$ which is sound and solves directed connectivity on all input graphs G where all but k of the vertices in $V(G)$ are lollipops and there is a path from s to t of length l in G.*

For our lower bounds, we improve the Fourier analysis techniques of Potechin [13] to obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 1.10. *If G is an input graph and z is an integer greater than 8 such that there is not path of length at most 2^z from s to t and for any vertex $v \in V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$ there are at most c vertices $w \in V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$ such that there is a path from v to w or a path from w to v of length at most 2^z then $m(G) \geq \frac{(\frac{n}{c})^{\frac{z}{4}}}{n^2 2^{4z^2}}$.*

1.3. **Notation and conventions.** We use the same notation and conventions as Potechin [13]. Throughout the paper, we use lower case letters (e.g v, e, f) to denote vertices, edges, and functions. We use upper case letters (e.g G, V, E) to denote graphs and sets of vertices, edges, or other objects. Uppercase script letters (e.g. $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C}$) are often used to denote a family or set of objects which are themselves graphs or sets. We use unprimed symbols to denote vertices, edges, etc. in the directed graph G, and we use primed symbols to denote vertices, edges, etc. in the switching network G'.
In this paper, we do not allow graphs to have loops or multiple edges from one vertex to another. When a graph has loops or multiple edges from one vertex to another we use the term multi-graph instead.

2. UPPER BOUNDS: SOLVING DIRECTED CONNECTIVITY WITH PARITY

In this section, we show that for input graphs with a very large number of "lollipops" (vertices $v \in V(G)$ for which there is an edge from s to v or an edge from v to t), the monotone space complexity of directed connectivity is low. In particular, we give a randomized generalization of Savitch's algorithm which requires less space when solving directed connectivity on such input graphs and construct a relatively small sound monotone switching network for directed connectivity which accepts all such input graphs.
The key idea is to work with sets of vertices together with a parity rather than looking at individual vertices. We begin by giving several useful definitions, propositions, and lemmas.

Definition 2.1. *We say a set of vertices $V \subseteq V(G)$ has even(odd) parity if there is an even(odd) m such that there are m vertices $w \in V$ such that there is an edge from w to t and for the other $|V| - m$ vertices $v \in V$ there is a an edge from s to v.*

Proposition 2.2. *If there is a set of vertices $V \subseteq V(G)$ with both even and odd parity then there is a path from s to t of length two.*

The next proposition shows that it is easy to calculate the parity of a set of vertices if it exists.

Proposition 2.3. *If $V \subseteq V(G)$ and $w \in V(G) \backslash V$ then $V \cup \{w\}$ has even(odd) parity if and only if either:*
1. V has even(odd) parity and there is an edge from s to w.
2. V has (odd)even parity and there is an edge from w to t.

Even if a set of vertices V does not have a parity, it may be close, i.e. there may be a vertex $v \in V$ such that $V \backslash \{v\}$ does have a parity p. Roughly speaking, we express this possibility by pairing V with p.

Definition 2.4. *A set of vertices with parity is a pair (V, p) where $V \subseteq V(G)$ and $p \in \{even, odd\}$.*

We now consider paths from one set of vertices with parity to another.

Definition 2.5. *Given two sets of vertices $U, V \subseteq V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$, we say there is a path of length l from U to V if there is a path of length l from a vertex $u \in U$ to a vertex $v \in V$.*

Definition 2.6. *If (U, p_1) and (V, p_2) are two sets of vertices with parity and $l \geq 1$ then we say that there is a path of length at most l from (U, p_1) to (V, p_2) if there are vertices $u \in U, v \in V$ such that:*
1. There is a path from $\{s, u\}$ to $\{v, t\}$ of length at most l.
2. $U \backslash \{u\}$ has parity p_1 and $V \backslash \{v\}$ has parity p_2.

Remark 2.7. *We are effectively treating the input graph as though it has a path from each other vertex to s of length 0 and a path from t to each other vertex of length 0. We can do this because adding such paths does not affect whether or not there is a path from s to t in G.*

Lemma 2.8. *If $(U, p_1), (V, p_2), (W, p_3)$ are sets of vertices with parity and there is a path of length at most $l_1 \geq 1$ from (U, p_1) to (V, p_2) and there is a path of length at most $l_2 \geq 1$ from (V, p_2) to (W, p_3) then there is a path of length at most $l_1 + l_2$ from (U, p_1) to (W, p_3)*

Proof. By definition, there are vertices u, v_1, v_2, w such that:
1. $u \in U$, $v_1, v_2 \in V$, and $w \in W$.
2. There is a path from $\{s, u\}$ to $\{v_1, t\}$ of length at most l_1.
3. There is a path from $\{s, v_2\}$ to $\{w, t\}$ of length at most l_2.
4. $U \backslash \{u\}$ has parity p_1, $V \backslash \{v_i\}$ has parity p_2 for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and $W \backslash \{w\}$ has parity p_3
If there is a path from $\{s, u\}$ to t of length at most l_1 or a path from $\{s\}$ to $\{w, t\}$ of length at most l_2 then we are done. Thus we may assume that there is a path from $\{s, u\}$ to v_1 of length at most l_1 and a path from v_2 to $\{w, t\}$ of length at most l_2. Then if $v_1 = v_2$ we are done, so we may assume $v_1 \neq v_2$.
But then by statement 4 and Proposition 2.3, either there is a path from s to t of length two (in which case we are done), an edge from s to both v_1 and v_2 (in which case we are done because there is a path from v_2 to $\{w, t\}$ of length at most l_2 and thus a path from s to $\{w, t\}$ of length at most $l_2 + 1 \leq l_1 + l_2$), or an edge from both v_1 and v_2 to t (in which case we are also done because there is a path from $\{s, u\}$ to $\{v_1\}$ of length at most l_1 and thus a path from $\{s, u\}$ to $\{t\}$ of length at most $l_1 + 1 \leq l_1 + l_2$) ☐

2.1. **Savitch's algorithm with parity.** We are now ready to give a randomized generalization of Savitch's algorithm. We first briefly recall how Savitch's algorithm works. To determine whether or not there is a path of length at most l from s to t, for each vertex $v \in V(G)$, we recursively check whether there is a path of length at most $\frac{l+1}{2}$ from s to v and whether there is a path of length at most $\frac{l}{2}$ from v to t. If $l = 1$ then we check directly whether there is an edge from s to t.
To see why the algorithm works, note that if both subpaths exist for some $v \in V(G)$ then there is a path of length at most l from s to t, so the algorithm is sound. If there is a path from s to t of length at most l then both subpaths will exist when v is the midpoint of the path, so the algorithm is complete. At each point, we have to remember at most $\lg l$ vertices, each of which represents $\lg n$ bits, so the total amount of space needed is at most $O(\lg n \lg l)$
Now assume that at most k of the vertices of G are not lollipops and there is a path from s to t of length at most l. Assume that $n = |V(G)| >> k$. We treat the randomness as an additional input which can be consulted at any time. This allows the algorithm to randomly pick and remember large subsets of vertices (because it is stored in the randomness). It is an open problem whether or not we can make a deterministic algorithm or weaken the type of randomness required.
Our algorithm works as follows. To check whether there is a path of length at most l from (U, p_1) to (W, p_3):
Repeat $40k$ times:
1. Pick a random set of vertices V of size roughly $\frac{n}{k}$ and a parity p_2.
2. Check recursively whether there is a path from (U, p_1) to (V, p_2) of length at most $\frac{l+1}{2}$ and a path from (V, p_2) to (W, p_3) of length at most $\frac{l}{2}$. If yes then accept, otherwise continue.
If $l = 1$ then we check directly whether there is a path from (U, p_1) to (W, p_3) of length at most one.

We will show by induction that the algorithm is sound and succeeds with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$. If the algorithm succeeds then by Lemma 2.8 and the inductive hypothesis there is a path of length at most l from (U, p_1) to (W, p_3). If there is a path of length at most $l \geq 2$ from (U, p_1) to (W, p_3) then take corresponding

u, w and let v be the $\frac{l+1}{2}$th vertex of the path from $\{s, u\}$ to $\{w, t\}$. If V is a set of vertices such that $v \in V$ and all other vertices in V are lollipops, then there is a parity p_2 such that there is a path from (U, p_1) to (V, p_2) of length at most $\frac{l+1}{2}$ and a path from (V, p_2) to (W, p_3) of length at most $\frac{l}{2}$.
If we choose a set of vertices V of size roughly $\frac{n}{k}$, the probability that the mth vertex of v is v and the others are all lollipops which are not v is roughly $(\frac{1}{n})(1-\frac{k}{n})^{\frac{n}{k}} \approx \frac{1}{ne}$. Thus, the probability that $v \in V$ and the other vertices are lollipops is at least $\frac{1}{ek}$ or so. The probability that we then choose the correct parity and the algorithm successfully finds the subpaths is at least $\frac{1}{8}$. Thus, the algorithm has at least a $\frac{1}{8ke}$ or so chance of succeeding on each iteration. These chances are independent so it easily follows that the algorithm succeeds with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ for any such input. Using repitition, this probability can be made arbitrarily close to 1.
To search for a path from s to t of length at most l, we search for a path from $(\{s\}, even)$ to $(\{t\}, even)$ of length at most l, and this is equivalent.
Now we just need to analyze how much space the algorithm uses. Remembering which iterations we are on (and thus where in the randomness we need to look to specify the sets of vertices and parities) takes $O(\lg l \lg k)$ space. Checking for a path of length at most one from one set of vertices with parity to another takes $O(\lg n)$ space. Thus, the total amount of space needed is $O(\lg n + \lg l \lg k)$. For comparison, Savitch's algorithm would ordinarily require $O(\lg l \lg n)$ space on such inputs.

Corollary 2.9. *There is a monotone circuit of size at most $2^{O(\lg n + \lg l \lg k)}$ and width $O(\lg n + \lg l \lg k)$ which is sound and solves directed connectivity on all input graphs G where all but k of the vertices in $V(G)$ are lollipops and there is a path from s to t of length l in G.*

Proof sketch:
There are at most M such input graphs where M is at most $2^{O(n^2)}$ and the algorithm succeeds with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ on each such input graph. If we repeat the algorithm at least $\lg M + 1$ times then the algorithm succeeds with probability greater than $1 - \frac{1}{M}$ on each such input graph, so there is a choice for the random bits which succeeds on all such input graphs. We can then create the required monotone circuit from the algorithm using these random bits.

Remark 2.10. *We can also use this algorithm to construct a monotone switching network of size $2^{O(\lg n + \lg l \lg k)} = n^{O(1)} k^{O(\lg l)}$ which accepts all such input graphs. In Appendix A we give a direct construction which gives a slightly more general result.*

3. LOWER BOUNDS

Let's briefly recall our general approach to lower bounds. For full details, see Sections 5-7 of Potechin [13].

Definition 3.1. *We define a cut of $V(G)$ to be a partition of $V(G)$ into subsets $L(C), R(C)$. We say an edge $v_1 \to v_2$ crosses C if $v_1 \in L(C) \cup \{s\}$ and $v_2 \in R(C) \cup \{t\}$.*
Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the set of all cuts C of $V(G)$. $|\mathcal{C}| = 2^n$.

We analyze the vector space of functions from $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. We have the following dot product and Fourier basis:

Definition 3.2. *Given two functions $f, g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$, $f \cdot g = 2^{-n} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} f(C) g(C)$*

Definition 3.3. *Given a set of vertices $V \subseteq V(G) \backslash \{s, t\}$, define $e_V : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $e_V(C) = (-1)^{|V \cap L(C)|}$.*

Proposition 3.4. *The set $\{e_V, V \subseteq V(G) \backslash \{s, t\}\}$ is an orthonormal basis for the vector space of functions from $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathbb{R}$.*

Definition 3.5. *Given a function $f : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ and a set of vertices $V \subseteq V(G) \backslash \{s, t\}$, define $\hat{f_V} = f \cdot e_V$.*

As shown in Proposition 5.3 of Potechin [13], given a sound monotone switching network G' we can assign each vertex $v' \in V(G') \cup \{s', t'\}$ a function $h_{v'} : \mathcal{C} \to \{-1, +1\}$ so that:
1. $\forall C \in \mathcal{C}, s'(C) = -1, t'(C) = 1$

2. If there is an edge $e' \in G'$ with label e between vertices v' and w' in G', then if $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and e does not cross C, then $v'(C) = w'(C)$.
For convenience, we identify each vertex $v' \in V(G') \cup \{s', t'\}$ with its corresponding function $h_{v'}$. Note that $\forall v' \in V(G') \cup \{s', t'\}, ||v'|| = 1$
Now our general approach is as follows. Given a set of input graphs I, we come up with a set of functions $\{g_{ji}\}$ such that for any sound monotone switching network G' which accepts all of the input graphs in I, we have that $\forall j \exists i, v'$ such that $v' \in V(G')$ and $v' \cdot g_{ji}$ is large. We then show that for the set of functions $\{g_{ji}\}$ that we chose, no matter what G' is, as long as $n' = |V(G')|$ is small there must be some j such that for all i, for all $v' \in V(G')$, $v' \cdot g_{ji}$ is small. This then implies that any sound monotone switching network G' which accepts all of the input graphs in I must be large, i.e. we have a lower size bound.
The difficult part is proving a bound on $\min_j \{\max_i \{\max_{v' \in V(G')} \{v' \cdot g_{ji}\}\}\}$ for all possible small G'. In Potechin [13] we did this by choosing the $\{g_{ji}\}$ to be orthogonal for distinct j and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. However, this technique does not seem to extend well to other sets of input graphs. Thus, we begin by developing alternative tools.

Definition 3.6. *Given a permutation $\sigma \in S_{V(G)}$ and a cut $C \in \mathcal{C}$, define $\sigma(C)$ to be the cut such that $L(\sigma(C)) = \sigma(L(C))$ and $R(\sigma(C)) = \sigma(R(C))$*

Definition 3.7. *Given a permutation $\sigma \in S_{V(G)}$ and a function $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$, define the function so that $\sigma(g)(\sigma(C)) = g(C)$, i.e. $\sigma(g)(C) = g(\sigma^{-1}(C))$*

Proposition 3.8. *For any function $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$, subset $A \subseteq V(G)$, and permutation $\sigma \in S_{V(G)}$,*
$\widehat{\sigma(g)}_{\sigma(A)} = \hat{g}_A$

Definition 3.9. *Given functions $g_1, g_2 : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$, define*
$s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g_1, g_2) = \sum_{A,B,C \subseteq V(G): |A|=k, |B|=u_1, |C|=u_2, A \cap B = A \cap C = B \cap C = \emptyset} \hat{g_1}_{A \cup B} \hat{g_2}_{A \cup C}$

The following theorem allows us to bound $\min_j \{\max_i \{\max_{v' \in V(G')} \{v' \cdot g_{ij}\}\}\}$ when we start with a set of functions $\{g_i\}$ and take $g_{ji} = \sigma_j(g_i)$ for all possible $\sigma_j \in S_{V(G)}$, as we have that for all G', for all $v' \in V(G')$, $||v'|| \leq 1$.

Theorem 3.10. *For any function $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\hat{g}_V$ is only nonzero when $|V|$ is much less than n, for any function $f : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$,*
$E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[(f \cdot \sigma(g))^2] \leq 2 \sum_{k,u_1,u_2} \frac{\sqrt{(k+u_1)!(k+u_2)!}}{n^{k+\frac{u_1+u_2}{2}}} (|s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g,g)|)||f||$

Proof.

Lemma 3.11. *For any functions $f, g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$,*
$E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[(f \cdot \sigma(g))^2] = \sum_{k,u_1,u_2} \frac{k!u_1!u_2!(n-k-u_1-u_2)!}{n!} s_{k,u_1,u_2}(f,f) s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g,g)$

Proof. $E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[(f \cdot \sigma(g))^2] = E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[(\sum_{V_1 \subseteq V(G)} \hat{f}_{V_1} \widehat{\sigma(g)}_{V_1})(\sum_{V_2 \subseteq V(G)} \hat{f}_{V_2} \widehat{\sigma(g)}_{V_2})]$
Taking $A = V_1 \cap V_2, B = V_1 \backslash V_2, C = V_2 \backslash V_1$, this is equal to
$E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[\sum_{k,u_1,u_2} \sum_{A,B,C \subseteq V(G): |A|=k, |B|=u_1, |C|=u_2, A \cap B = A \cap C = B \cap C = \emptyset} \hat{f}_{A \cup B} \hat{f}_{A \cup C} \widehat{\sigma(g)}_{A \cup B} \widehat{\sigma(g)}_{A \cup C}] =$
$\sum_{k,u_1,u_2} \sum_{A,B,C \subseteq V(G): |A|=k, |B|=u_1, |C|=u_2, A \cap B = A \cap C = B \cap C = \emptyset} \hat{f}_{A \cup B} \hat{f}_{A \cup C} E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[\widehat{\sigma(g)}_{A \cup B} \widehat{\sigma(g)}_{A \cup C}]$
Now $E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[\widehat{\sigma(g)}_{A \cup B} \widehat{\sigma(g)}_{A \cup C}] = E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[\hat{g}_{\sigma^{-1}(A \cup B)} \hat{g}_{\sigma^{-1}(A \cup C)}] = \frac{k!u_1!u_2!(n-k-u_1-u_2)!}{n!} s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g,g)$
This is independent of A, B, and C, so we deduce that
$E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[(f \cdot \sigma(g))^2] = \sum_{k,u_1,u_2} \frac{k!u_1!u_2!(n-k-u_1-u_2)!}{n!} s_{k,u_1,u_2}(f,f) s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g,g)$, as needed ☐

We now wish to bound how large $|s_{k,u_1,u_2}(f,f)|$ can be in terms of $||f||$.

Definition 3.12. *Given a function $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ and subset $A \subseteq V(G)$, define*
$s_{A,u_1}(g) = \sum_{B \subseteq V(G): |B|=u_1, A \cap B = \emptyset} \hat{g}_{A \cup B}$
$s_{A,u_1,u_2}(g_1, g_2) = \sum_{B,C \subseteq V(G): |B|=u_1, |C|=u_2, A \cap B = A \cap C = B \cap C = \emptyset} \hat{g_1}_{A \cup B} \hat{g_2}_{A \cup C}$

Proposition 3.13. $\forall A, s_{A,u_1}(g_1)s_{A,u_2}(g_2) = \sum_{u\geq 0}\sum_{A\subseteq B\subseteq V(G),|B|=|A|+u} s_{B,u_1-u,u_2-u}(g_1,g_2)$

Corollary 3.14. $\forall k, u_1, u_2, \sum_{A:|A|=k} s_{A,u_1}(g_1)s_{A,u_2}(g_2) = \sum_{u\geq 0}\binom{k+u}{u}s_{k+u,u_1-u,u_2-u}(g_1,g_2)$

Proof. This follows immediately when we sum Proposition 3.13 over all A of size k. ☐

Surprisingly, Corollary 3.14 has an almost identical inverse formula.

Lemma 3.15. $\forall k, u_1, u_2, s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g_1,g_2) = \sum_{u\geq 0}(-1)^u\binom{k+u}{u}\sum_{A:|A|=k+u} s_{A,u_1-u}(g_1)s_{A,u_2-u}(g_2)$

Proof. This lemma corresponds to the fact that the inverse of a matrix like

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \binom{k+1}{1} & \binom{k+2}{2} & \binom{k+3}{3} \\ 0 & 1 & \binom{k+2}{1} & \binom{k+3}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \binom{k+3}{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\binom{k+1}{1} & \binom{k+2}{2} & -\binom{k+3}{3} \\ 0 & 1 & -\binom{k+2}{1} & \binom{k+3}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -\binom{k+3}{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Calculating directly, these matrices are inverses because of the combinatorial identity $\sum_{k=0}^{m}(-1)^k\frac{1}{k!(m-k)!} = \frac{(1+(-1))^m}{m!} = 0$ if $m \geq 1$ and 1 if $m = 0$. ☐

To bound how large $|s_{k,u_1,u_2}(f,f)|$ can be in terms of $||f||$, we just need bounds for how large expressions of the form $\sum_{A:|A|=k} s_{A,u_1}(g)s_{A,u_2}(g)$ can be.

Proposition 3.16. $\forall k, u_1, u_2, |\sum_{A:|A|=k} s_{A,u_1}(g)s_{A,u_2}(g)| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{A:|A|=k}(s_{A,u_1}(g))^2\sum_{A:|A|=k}(s_{A,u_2}(g))^2}$

Proof. This follows immediately from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. ☐

Proposition 3.17. *For all k, u_1 and all A with $|A| = k$,* $(s_{A,u_1}(g))^2 \leq \binom{n-k}{u_1}\sum_{B\subseteq V(G):|B|=u_1,A\cap B=\emptyset}(\hat{g}_{A\cup B})^2$

Proof. This follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality
$(\sum_{B\subseteq V(G):|B|=u_1,A\cap B=\emptyset} f(B)h(B))^2 \leq \sum_{B\subseteq V(G):|B|=u_1,A\cap B=\emptyset}(f(B))^2\sum_{B\subseteq V(G):|B|=u_1,A\cap B=\emptyset}(h(B))^2$
with $f(B) = 1$ and $h(B) = \hat{g}_{A\cup B}$. ☐

Corollary 3.18. $\forall k, u_1, \sum_{A:|A|=k}(s_{A,u_1}(g))^2 \leq \binom{n-k}{u_1}\binom{k+u_1}{u_1}||g||^2$

Proof. This follows immediately when we sum Proposition 3.17 over all A of size k. ☐

Corollary 3.19. $\forall k, u_1, u_2, |\sum_{A:|A|=k} s_{A,u_1}(g)s_{A,u_2}(g)| \leq \sqrt{\binom{n-k}{u_1}\binom{n-k}{u_2}\binom{k+u_1}{u_1}\binom{k+u_2}{u_2}}||g||$

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 3.16 and Corollary 3.18 ☐

Corollary 3.20. *If f is a function $f : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$, we have that for all k, u_1, u_2,*
$|s_{k,u_1,u_2}(f,f)| \leq \sum_{u\geq 0}\binom{k+u}{u}\sqrt{\binom{n-k-u}{u_1-u}\binom{n-k-u}{u_2-u}\binom{k+u_1}{u_1-u}\binom{k+u_2}{u_2-u}}||f||$
If $n >> k, u$ (which will always be the case for our analysis) then
$|s_{k,u_1,u_2}(f,f)| \leq 2\sqrt{\binom{n}{u_1}\binom{n}{u_2}\binom{k+u_1}{u_1}\binom{k+u_2}{u_2}}||f||$

Proof. This follows immediately from Corollary 3.19 and Lemma 3.15. ☐

Theorem 3.10 now follows easily. By Lemma 3.11,
$E_{\sigma\in S_{V(G)}}[(f\cdot\sigma(g))^2] = \sum_{k,u_1,u_2}\frac{k!u_1!u_2!(n-k-u_1-u_2)!}{n!}s_{k,u_1,u_2}(f,f)s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g,g)$
Now by Corollary 3.20,
$E_{\sigma\in S_{V(G)}}[(f\cdot\sigma(g))^2] \leq 2\sum_{k,u_1,u_2}\frac{\sqrt{(k+u_1)!(k+u_2)!}}{n^{k+\frac{u_1+u_2}{2}}}(|s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g,g)|)||f||$, as needed. ☐

For the functions g we will be looking at, it is difficult to bound $|s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g,g)|$ directly, so we would like a bound that is easier to use.

Corollary 3.21. *For any function $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\hat{g}_V$ is only nonzero when $|V| = z$ for some $z < n^{\frac{1}{3}}$, for any function $f : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$,*
$E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[(f \cdot \sigma(g))^2] \leq 20\frac{z^z}{n^z}||f|| \max_{k \in [0,z]} \{\sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,z-k}(g))^2\}$

Proof. By Theorem 3.10,
$E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[(f \cdot \sigma(g))^2] \leq 2\sum_{k,u_1,u_2} \frac{\sqrt{(k+u_1)!(k+u_2)!}}{n^{k+\frac{u_1+u_2}{2}}}(|s_{k,u_1,u_2}(g,g)|)||f|| = 2\frac{z!}{n^z}||f|| \sum_{k=0}^{z} |s_{k,z-k,z-k}(g,g)|$
By Lemma 3.15,
$|s_{k,z-k,z-k}(g,g)| \leq \sum_{u=0}^{z-k} \binom{k+u}{u} \sum_{A:|A|=k+u} (s_{A,z-u}(g))^2 \leq$
$(\sum_{u=0}^{z} \binom{z}{u}) \max_{k \in [0,z]} \{\sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,z-k}(g))^2\} \leq 2^z \max_{k \in [0,z]} \{\sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,z-k}(g))^2\}$
Thus we have that $E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[(f \cdot \sigma(g))^2] \leq 2\frac{z(2^z)z!}{n^z}||f|| \max_{k \in [0,z]} \{\sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,z-k}(g))^2\}$ and it can be verified by direct computation that $\forall z \geq 1, 10z^z \geq z(2^z)z!$, so the result follows. ☐

3.1. **The usefulness of a base function.**

Definition 3.22. *We call a function $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ a base function for the input graph G with cutoff z if the following is true:*
1. $\hat{g}_{\{\}} = 1$
2. $\hat{g}_V = 0$ if $|V| \geq z$
3. If $e = s \to v \in E(G)$ and we have that $v \in V$ and $|V| < z$ then $\hat{g}_V = -\hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v\}}$
4. If $e = v \to t \in E(G)$ and we have that $v \in V$ and $|V| < z$ then $\hat{g}_V = \hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v\}}$
5. If $e = v_1 \to v_2 \in E(G)$ and we have that $v_1, v_2 \in V$ and $|V| < z$ then
$\hat{g}_V = \hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\}} - \hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v_2\}} + \hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v_1\}}$

It turns out that to obtain lower size bounds on $m(G)$ it is sufficient to construct and analyze a good base function for G with cutoff z. In particular, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.23. *If $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a base function for the input graph G with cutoff z then*
$m(G) \geq \frac{1}{50(n^2)}\sqrt{(\frac{n^z}{z^z \max_{k \in [0,z], j \in \{1,2\}} \{\sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,z-k-j}(g))^2\}})}$

The proof of this theorem is long, technical, and requires a good knowledge of the lower bound techniques in Potechin [13] and is thus relegated to Appendix B.

3.2. **Constructing a good base function.**

In this section, we construct a good base function g for the input graph G with cutoff z. This construction gives us the following theorem. However, the proof involves some lengthy calculations so we put it in Appendix C.

Definition 3.24. *We say vertices $u, v \in V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$ are l-connected if $v \neq s$ and there is a path of length at most l from u to v or $u \neq t$ and there is a path of length at most l from v to u. Note that each vertex is l-connected to itself for any $l \geq 0$.*

Theorem 3.25. *If G is an input graph and z is an integer greater than 8 such that s and t are not 2^z-connected and for any vertex $v \in V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$ there are at most c vertices $w \in V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$ such that v and w are 2^z-connected then $m(G) \geq \frac{(\frac{n}{c})^{\frac{z}{4}}}{n^2 2^{4z^2}}$.*

For our construction, we will choose the coefficients $\hat{g}_V$ from smallest $|V|$ to largest $|V|$. For some of these coefficients, we can choose its value freely, for other coefficients the value will already be determined by our previous choices. The following lemma tells us which coefficients we can choose freely and which will be predetermined. This lemma follows from Sections 3 and 6 of Potechin [13] and is stated without proof.

Lemma 3.26. *Let G be a directed acyclic input graph such that s and t are not 2^z-connected.*
When we are choosing the base function g with cutoff z and choosing the coefficient $\hat{g}_V$:
1. If there is a vertex $v \in V$ such that s and v are $2^{z-|V|-1}$-connected then we must set $\hat{g}_V = -\hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v\}}$
2. If there is a vertex $v \in V$ such that v and t are $2^{z-|V|-1}$-connected then we must set $\hat{g}_V = \hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v\}}$
3. If there are vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V$ such that there is a path of length at most $2^{z-|V|-1}$ from v_1 to v_2 then we must set $\hat{g}_V = \hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v_1\}} - \hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v_2\}} + \hat{g}_{V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\}}$
4. If none of the above cases holds then we may freely choose $\hat{g}_V$.

Actually, instead of choosing the coefficients $\hat{g}_V$ directly, we will choose the values $s_{V,u}(g)$ in increasing order of $j = u + |V|$ and increasing order of $k = |V|$ for equal values of j. Many of our choices will be determined for us by the following corollary of Lemma 3.26.

Corollary 3.27. *When choosing the values for the sums $s_{V,u}(g)$, we have the following:*
1. If there is a vertex $v \in V$ such that s and v are $2^{z-|V|-u-1}$-connected then
$s_{V,u}(g) = -s_{V \setminus \{v\},u}(g) + s_{V,u-1}(g)$
2. If there is a vertex $v \in V$ such that v and t are $2^{z-|V|-u-1}$-connected then
$s_{V,u}(g) = s_{V \setminus \{v\},u}(g) - s_{V,u-1}(g)$
3. If there are vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V$ such that there is a path of length at most $2^{z-|V|-u-1}$ from v_1 to v_2 then
$s_{V,u}(g) = s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},u}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},u}(g) + s_{V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\},u}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},u-1}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},u-1}(g) + s_{V,u-2}(g)$

Proof. In case 1,
$s_{V \setminus \{v\},u}(g) = \sum_{B: V \setminus \{v\} \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-1} \hat{g}_B = \sum_{B: V \setminus \{v\} \subseteq B, v \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-1} \hat{g}_B + \sum_{B: V \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-1} \hat{g}_B$
$= \sum_{B: V \setminus \{v\} \subseteq B, v \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-1} -\hat{g}_{B \cup \{v\}} + s_{V,u-1}(g) = -s_{V,u}(g) + s_{V,u-1}(g)$
In case 2, using similar logic we obtain that
$s_{V \setminus \{v\},u}(g) = s_{V,u}(g) + s_{V,u-1}(g)$
In case 3,
$s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},u}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},u}(g) + s_{V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\},u}(g) =$
$\sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_1\} \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-1} \hat{g}_B - \sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_2\} \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-1} \hat{g}_B + \sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\} \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B =$
$(\sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_1\} \subseteq B, v_1 \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-1} \hat{g}_B + \sum_{B: V \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-1} \hat{g}_B) -$
$(\sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_2\} \subseteq B, v_2 \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-1} \hat{g}_B + \sum_{B: V \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-1} \hat{g}_B) +$
$(\sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\} \subseteq B, v_1,v_2 \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B + \sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_2\} \subseteq B, v_2 \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B +$
$\sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_1\} \subseteq B, v_1 \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B + \sum_{B: V \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B) =$
$(\sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\} \subseteq B, v_1,v_2 \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-2} (\hat{g}_{B \cup \{v_2\}} - \hat{g}_{B \cup \{v_1\}} + \hat{g}_B)) +$
$(\sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_2\} \subseteq B, v_2 \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B + \sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_1\} \subseteq B, v_1 \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B + \sum_{B: V \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B) =$
$\sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\} \subseteq B, v_1,v_2 \notin B, |B| = |V|+u-2} (\hat{g}_{B \cup \{v_1,v_2\}}) +$
$(\sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_2\} \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B + \sum_{B: V \setminus \{v_1\} \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B - \sum_{B: V \subseteq B, |B| = |V|+u-2} \hat{g}_B) =$
$s_{V,u}(g) + s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},u-1}(g) + s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},u-1}(g) - s_{V,u-2}(g)$
$s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},u}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},u}(g) + s_{V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\},u}(g) = s_{V,u}(g) + s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},u-1}(g) + s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},u-1}(g) - s_{V,u-2}(g)$
$s_{V,u}(g) = s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},u}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},u}(g) + s_{V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\},u}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},u-1}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},u-1}(g) + s_{V,u-2}(g)$ ☐

Additionally, we have the obvious restriction that
$\forall A, s_{A,u}(g) = \sum_{B: A \subseteq B, |B| = |A|+1} s_{B,u-1}(g)$ whenever $u \geq 1$
To deal with this restriction we will first assign target values $t(A,u)$ which will be adjusted as needed. Given the target values $t(A,u)$, we define $a(A,u) = \sum_{B: A \subseteq B, |B| = |A|+1} t(B, u-1)$ whenever $u \geq 1$. Once we have ensured that $a(A,u) = t(A,u)$ for all $u \geq 1$ and A such that $|A| = j - u$ and that $t(A,u)$ has the correct value whenever it is determined by Corollary 3.27, we can set $s_{A,u}(g) = t(A,u)$ and move on to the next j. The choices for $u = 0$ correspond to choosing the actual coefficients $\hat{g}_V$. For our construction, we will use the following lemma.

Lemma 3.28. *Let $V \subseteq V(G)$ be a set of vertices such that no two distinct vertices of $V \cup \{s,t\}$ are $2^{z-|V|-u-1}$-connected and let $k = |V|$. If there is a set of vertices W such that $|W| = k+1$, $V \cap W = \emptyset$,* *and no two distinct vertices of* $V \cup W \cup \{s,t\}$ *are* $2^{z-|V|-u-1}$*-connected then we can adjust the value of* $a(V,u)$ *by adjusting the values of* $t(U,u-1)(g)$ *for the* $U \subseteq V \cup W$ *of size* $k+1$ *so that the values* $a(V_2,u)$ *are unaffected for all* V_2 *such that* $|V_2| = k$ *and* $V_2 \neq V$*. Moreover, we can do this so that the sum of the magnitudes of the adjustments to the* $t_{U,u-1}$ *is at most* 2^k *times the magnitude of the adjustment to* $a(V,u)$*.*

Proof. Let $l = |U \cap V|$ and $m = |U \cap W| = k+1-l$.
Increase each $t(U,u-1)$ by $(-1)^{m+1}(\frac{1}{m\binom{k+1}{m}})$ for $m \neq 0$.
Then for each $V_2 \subseteq V \cup W$ with $|V_2| = k$, letting $m_2 = |V_2 \cap W|$ we have that the net change to $a(V_2,u)$ for $m_2 \geq 1$ is $m_2(-1)^{(m_2+1)}(\frac{1}{(m_2)\binom{k+1}{m_2}}) + (k+1-m_2)(-1)^{(m_2+1)+1}(\frac{1}{(m_2+1)\binom{k+1}{m_2+1}}) =$
$(-1)^{(m_2+1)}(\frac{(m_2)(m_2)!(k+1-m_2)!}{(m_2)(k+1)!} - \frac{(k+1-m_2)(m_2+1)!(k-m_2)!}{(m_2+1)(k+1)!}) = 0$
The net change to $a(V,u)$ is $(k+1)\frac{1}{k+1} = 1$.
To see the moreover part, note that
$\sum_{m=1}^{k+1}\binom{k}{l}\binom{k+1}{m}(\frac{1}{m\binom{k+1}{m}}) \leq \sum_{m=1}^{k+1}\binom{k}{k+1-m} \leq 2^k$ □

We are now ready to choose the values for $s_{V,u}(g)$ as described above and thus construct g. Our goal will be to make the values of $s_{V,u}(g)$ small. We will do this as follows:
For each $j \in [1, z-1]$:
1. For each V, consider whether $s_{V,j-|V|}(g)$ is determined by Corollary 3.27. If so, set $t(V, j-|V|)$ accordingly. If not, then set $t(V, j-|V|) = 0$.
2. For each $k \in [0,j]$, for each V such that $|V| = k$, if $s_{V,j-|V|}(g)$ was not fixed by Corollary 3.27 then adjust $a(V, j-|V|)$ to equal $t(V, j-|V|)$ using Lemma 3.28. However, instead of choosing only one valid W, split up the adjustment equally among all possible valid W.
3. After doing this, unless there was a case when we could not use Lemma 3.28 because there was no valid W, we will have that $a(A, j-|A|) = t(A, j-|A|)$ for all $A \subseteq V(G)$ with $|A| \leq j-1$, so we can set $s_{A,j-|A|}(g) = t(A, j-|A|)$.
As shown in Appendix C, under the conditions of Theorem 3.25 this will succeed and give us a good base function g.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Aleliunas, R. M. Karp, R. J.Lipton, L. Lovász, and C. Rackoff. Random walks, universal traversal sequences, and the complexity of maze problems. Proceedings of the 20th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, p. 218-223, 1979

[2] N. Alon and R. B. Boppana. The monotone circuit complexity of boolean functions. Combinatorica 7 no. 1, p. 1-22, 1987

[3] S. Chan, A. Potechin. Tight bounds for monotone switching networks via fourier analysis. STOC 2012

[4] S. A. Cook and C. W. Rackoff. Space lower bounds for maze threadability on restricted machines. SIAM Journal on Computing 9(3), p. 636-652, 1980

[5] J. Edmonds, C. K. Poon, and D. Achlioptas. Tight lower bounds for st-connectivity on the NNJAG model. SIAM Journal on Computing 28(6), p. 2257-2284, 1999

[6] M. Gringi and M. Sipser. Monotone complexity. Proceedings of LMS workshop on boolean function complexity (M.S. Paterson, ed.), Durhan, Cambridge University Press, 1990

[7] A Haken. Counting bottlenecks to show monotone P $\neq$ NP. Proceedings of the 36th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, p. 36-40, 1995

[8] N. Immerman. Nondeterministic Space is Closed Under Complementation. SIAM J. Comput. 17, p. 935-938, 1988

[9] M. Karchmer and A. Wigderson. Monotone circuits for connectivity require superlogarithmic depth. Proceedings of ACM STOC'88, p. 539-550, 1988

[10] C. Y. Lee. Representation of Switching Functions by Binary Decision Programs. Bell Systems Technical Journal 38, p. 985-999, 1959

[11] P. Lu, J. Zhang, C. K. Poon, and J. Y. Cai. Simulating Undirected st-Connectivity Algorithms on Uniform JAGs and NNJAGs. ISAAC 2005

[12] W. Masek. A fast algorithm for the string editing problem and decision graph complexity. Master's Thesis, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1976

[13] A. Potechin. Bounds on monotone switching networks for directed connectivity. arXiv:0911.0664v5

[14] R. Raz, P. McKenzie. Separation of the monotone NC hierarchy. Proceedings of the 38th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, p. 234-243, 1997

[15] A. Razborov. Lower bounds for the monotone complexity of some boolean functions. Soviet Mathematics Doklady 31, p. 354-357, 1985

[16] A. Razborov. Lower Bounds for Deterministic and Nondeterministic Branching Programs. Proceedings of the 8th FCT, Lecture Notes in Computer Science vol. 529, p. 47-60, 1991

[17] O. Reingold. Undirected ST-connectivity in Log-Space. STOC 2005

[18] W. J. Savitch. Relationship between nondeterministic and deterministic tape classes. J.CSS 4, p. 177-192, 1970

[19] C. Shannon. A symbolic analysis of relay and switching networks. Transactions of American Institute of Electrical Engineers 57, p. 713,723, 1938

[20] C. Shannon. The synthesis of two-terminal switching circuits. Bell Systems Technical Journal 28(1), p. 59-98, 1949

[21] R. Szelepcsényi. The method of forcing for nondeterministic automata. Bull. EATCS 33, p. 96-100, 1987

[22] V. Trifonov. An O(log n log log n) space algorithm for undirected st-connectivity. Proceedings of the thirty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, May 2005

APPENDIX A. A SMALL MONOTONE SWITCHING NETWORK

In this section, we give a direct construction of a small monotone switching network solving input graphs which have a very large number of lollipops, obtaining the following result. For this section, it is assumed that the reader is familiar with certain-knowledge switching networks. For background on certain knowledge switching networks, see Section 3 of Potechin [13].

Definition A.1. *Define the complexity of a knowledge set K to be*
$c(K) = |\{v : v \neq s, t, v \to w \in E(K)$ *or* $w \to v \in E(K)$ *for some* $w \in V(G) \cup \{s,t\}\}|$.
Define the complexity of a certain knowledge switching network G' to be $\max_{v' \in V(G')} \{c(K_{v'})\}$.

Theorem A.2. *Let G_0 be an input graph with $|V(G_0)| = k$ and which is accepted by a certain knowledge switching network G'_0 with complexity c and size n'. Let G be an input graph which contains G_0 as a subgraph and where all of the vertices in $V(G) \backslash V(G_0)$ are lollipops. Then $m(G)$ is at most $n^{O(1)} k^{O(c)} n'$ where $n = |V(G)|$.*

Before describing the construction, we need a few more preliminary results.
We first consider how to extend Definition 2.6 for paths of length zero. We could try to use the definition directly for $l = 0$. However, it turns out that this is not transitive. Instead, we use the following definition which is transitive:

Definition A.3. *For a given input graph G, we say (V_1, p_1) and (V_2, p_2) are G-equivalent if either:*
1. V_1 has parity p_1 and V_2 has parity p_2.
2. V_1 has the opposite parity of p_1 and V_2 has the opposite parity of p_2.
3. $\exists v \in V_1 \cap V_2 : V_1 \backslash \{v\}$ has parity p_1 and $V_2 \backslash \{v\}$ has parity p_2.

Lemma A.4. *If there is no path from s to t of length two in G then G-equivalence is an equivalence relation.*

Proof. Reflexivity and symmetry are obvious, so we just need to show transitivity. Assume that (V_1, p_1) and (V_2, p_2) are G-equivalent and that (V_2, p_2) and (V_3, p_3) are G-equivalent. If V_2 has parity p_2 then either V_1 has parity p_1 or there is a vertex v such that $V_1 \cap V_2 = \{v\}$, $V_1 \backslash \{v\}$ has parity p_1, and $V_2 \backslash \{v\}$ has parity p_2. In the second case, since there is no path from s to t of length two, by Proposition 2.3 there must be an edge from s to v and this implies that V_1 has parity p_1. Thus, in either case we have that V_1 has parity p_1. Following similar logic, V_3 must have parity p_3 and we are done.
If V_2 has the opposite parity of p_2 then either V_1 has the opposite parity of p_1 or there is a vertex v such that $V_1 \cap V_2 = \{v\}$, $V_1 \backslash \{v\}$ has parity p_1, and $V_2 \backslash \{v\}$ has parity p_2. In the second case, since there is no path from s to t of length two, by Proposition 2.3 there must be an edge from v to t and this implies that V_1 has the opposite parity of p_1. Thus, in either case we have that V_1 has the opposite parity of p_1. Following similar logic, V_3 must have the opposite parity of p_3 and we are done.
If V_2 does not have any parity then there exist $u \in V_1 \cap V_2, w \in V_2 \cap V_3$ such that $V_1 \backslash \{u\}$ has parity p_1, $V_1 \backslash \{u\}$ and $V_1 \backslash \{w\}$ have parity p_2, and $V_3 \backslash \{w\}$ has parity p_3. Also, we must have that $u = w$ as otherwise V_2 would have a parity. But then it follows immediately that (V_1, p_1) and (V_3, p_3) are G-equivalent, so we are done. ☐

Proposition A.5. *If (V_1, p_1) and (V_2, p_2) are G-equivalent then there is a path of length at most one from (V_1, p_1) to (V_2, p_2) and a path of length at most one from (V_2, p_2) to (V_1, p_1).*

Proof. This follows immediately from Definitions 2.6 and Definition A.3. ☐

Corollary A.6. *If (V_1, p_1) and (V_2, p_2) are G-equivalent then:*
1. If there is a path of length at most $l \geq 1$ from (U, p) to (V_1, p_1) then there is a path of length at most $l + 1$ from (U, p) to (V_2, p_2).
2. If there is a path of length at most $l \geq 1$ from (V_1, p_1) to (W, p) then there is a path of length at most $l + 1$ from (V_2, p_2) to (W, p).

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 2.8 and Proposition A.5. ☐

We are now ready to give our construction.

Proof of Theorem A.2. To construct the monotone switching network, we do the following for each $j \in [1, m]$, where m will be chosen later:
1. Randomly choose k sets of vertices $V_{vj} \subseteq V(G), v \in V(G_0)$ where each set of vertices has size $\approx \frac{n}{k}$.
2. Randomly choose a parity p_{vj} for each V_{vj}.
3. Take G'_0 and replace each edge with label $v_1 \to v_2$ with a monotone switching network testing whether there is a path of length at most one from $(V_{v_1 j}, p_{v_1 j})$ to $(V_{v_2 j}, p_{v_2 j})$. We take $V_{sj} = \{s\}$, $V_{tj} = \{t\}$, and $p_{sj} = p_{tj} = even$. Call the resulting monotone switching network G'_{0j}. For each $v' \in V(G'_0)$, let v'_j be its copy in G'_{0j}

After constructing all of the G'_{0j}, we do the following:
1. Merge all of the s'_j together into one s' and merge all of the t'_j together into one t'.
2. For each vertex $v' \in V(G'_0)$, if $K_{v'}$ mentions vertices $v_1, \cdots, v_k$ then for each pair of distinct j_1, j_2 in $[1, m]$, create a monotone switching network between v'_{j_1} and v'_{j_2} which computes whether $(V_{v_i j_1}, p_{v_i j_1})$ and $(V_{v_i j_2}, p_{v_i j_2})$ are H-equivalent for all i, where H is the input graph.
3. Finally, add an additional monotone switching network between s' and t' computing whether or not there is a path from s to t of length at most two.

It follows from Lemma 2.8, Corollary A.6, and the soundness of G'_0 that this monotone switching network G' is sound. We just need to analyze when G' accepts an input graph H where $H = \sigma(G)$ for some $\sigma \in S_{V(G)}$.

Definition A.7. *We say that (V_{vj}, p_{vj}) is H-valid if $\sigma(v) \in V_{vj}$ and $V_{vj} \backslash \{\sigma(v)\}$ has parity p_{vj} for H.*

Proposition A.8. *If (V_{vj_1}, p_{vj_1}) and (V_{vj_2}, p_{vj_2}) are both H-valid then they are H-equivalent.*

Corollary A.9. *Given an input graph $H = \sigma(G)$ and vertex $v' \in V(G'_0)$, let $v_1, \cdots, v_k$ be the vertices mentioned by $K_{v'}$. If for some $j_1, j_2 \in [1, m]$, $(V_{v_i j_1}, p_{v_i j_1})$ and $(V_{v_i j_2}, p_{v_i j_2})$ are H-valid for all i, then there is a path from v'_{j_1} to v'_{j_2} when H is the input graph.*

Proposition A.10. *If e' is an edge between vertices u' and v' in G'_0 with label e, then if (V_{vj}, p_{vj}) is H-valid for all vertices v mentioned by $K_{u'}$, $K_{v'}$, and e then there is a path from u'_j to v'_j when H is the input graph.*

Corollary A.11. *If $H = \sigma(G)$ is an input graph and we have that for all $e' \in E(G'_0)$ there is a j such that (V_{vj}, p_{vj}) is H-valid for all vertices v mentioned by $K_{u'}$, $K_{v'}$, and e, then G' accepts H.*

Proof. This follows from Corollary A.9, Proposition A.10, and the fact that G'_0 accepts G_0. ☐

Thus, we just need to guarantee that for all input graphs $H = \sigma(G)$ and all $e' \in E(G'_0)$ there is a j such that (V_{vj}, p_{vj}) is H-valid for all vertices v mentioned by $K_{u'}$, $K_{v'}$, and e.

Given a given set of vertices U and input graph H, the probability that (V_{vj}, p_{vj}) is H-valid for all vertices in U is at least $(\frac{1}{2ek})^{|U|}$ or so. There are at most 2^{n^2} inputs to check and at most $(n+1)^{2c+2}$ sets of vertices of size at most $2c + 2$. This implies that we can take m to be $n^{O(1)}k^{O(c)}$ and guarantee that with nonzero probability, for all input graphs $H = \sigma(G)$ and all $e' \in E(G'_0)$ there is a j such that (V_{vj}, p_{vj}) is H-valid for all vertices v mentioned by $K_{u'}$, $K_{v'}$, and e. This implies that at least one of the switching networks constructed with this m will work and it can be verified that it will have size $n^{O(1)}k^{O(c)}n'$, as needed. ☐

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.23

We recall the statement of Theorem 3.23 below.

Theorem 3.23. *If $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a base function for the input graph G with cutoff z then*
$m(G) \geq \frac{1}{50(n^2)}\sqrt{(\frac{n^z}{z^z \max_{k\in[0,z],j\in\{1,2\}}\{\sum_{A:|A|=k}(s_{A,z-k-j}(g))^2\}})}$
Before proving this theorem, we need some preliminary results.

Definition B.1. *Given a base function g for G with cutoff z and an edge $e \in E(G)$, we define g_e so that*
1. If $|V| < z$ then $\hat{g}_{eV} = \hat{g}_V$
2. If $|V| > z$ then $\hat{g}_{eV} = 0$
3. If $|V| = z$ and e is of the form $s \to v$ then $\hat{g}_{eV} = -\hat{g}_{V\setminus\{v\}}$ if $v \in V$ and 0 otherwise.
4. If $|V| = z$ and e is of the form $v \to t$ then $\hat{g}_{eV} = \hat{g}_{V\setminus\{v\}}$ if $v \in V$ and 0 otherwise.
5. If $|V| = z$ and e is of the form $v_1 \to v_2$ then $\hat{g}_{eV} = \hat{g}_{V\setminus\{v_1,v_2\}} - \hat{g}_{V\setminus\{v_2\}} + \hat{g}_{V\setminus\{v_1\}}$ if $v_1, v_2 \in V$, $\hat{g}_{eV} = \hat{g}_{V\setminus v_1}$ if $v_1 \in V, v_2 \notin V$, and $\hat{g}_{eV} = 0$ otherwise.

Proposition B.2. *$\forall e \in E(G)$, g_e is e-invariant i.e. $g_e(C) = 0$ for any cut that can be crossed by e.*

For the lower bounds, we will be applying Corollary 3.21 to functions of the form $g_i = g_{e_1} - g_{e_2}$ where $e_1, e_2 \in E(G)$. Thus, our goal is to bound $\max_{k\in[0,z]}\{\sum_{A:|A|=k}(s_{A,z-k}(g_{e_1} - g_{e_2}))^2\}$

Lemma B.3. *If $e \in E(G)$ is of the form $s \to v$ then we have that*
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = -s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g) + s_{V\cup\{v\},z-|V|-2}(g)$ *if* $v \notin V$
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = -s_{V\setminus\{v\},z-|V|}(g) + s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g)$ *if* $v \in V$

Proof. If $v \notin V$ then
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = \sum_{A:|A|=z,V\cup\{v\}\subseteq A}\hat{g}_{eA} = -\sum_{A:|A|=z,V\cup\{v\}\subseteq A}\hat{g}_{A\setminus\{v\}} = -\sum_{A:|A|=z-1,V\subseteq A,v\notin A}\hat{g}_A$
$= -s_{V,z-1-|V|}(g) + \sum_{A:|A|=z-1,V\subseteq A,v\in A}\hat{g}_A = -s_{V,z-1-|V|}(g) + s_{V\cup\{v\},z-|V|-2}(g)$
If $v \in V$ then
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = \sum_{A:|A|=z,V\subseteq A}\hat{g}_{eA} = -\sum_{A:|A|=z,V\subseteq A}\hat{g}_{A\setminus\{v\}} = -\sum_{A:|A|=z-1,V\setminus\{v\}\subseteq A,v\notin A}\hat{g}_A$
$= -s_{V\setminus\{v\},z-|V|}(g) + \sum_{A:|A|=z-1,V\setminus\{v\}\subseteq A,v\in A}\hat{g}_A = -s_{V\setminus v,z-|V|}(g) + s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g)$ ☐

Lemma B.4. *If $e \in E(G)$ is of the form $v \to t$ then we have that*
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V\cup\{v\},z-|V|-2}(g)$ *if* $v \notin V$
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = s_{V\setminus\{v\},z-|V|}(g) - s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g)$ *if* $v \in V$

Proof. This can be proved in a similar way. ☐

Lemma B.5. *If $e \in E(G)$ is of the form $v_1 \to v_2$ then we have that*
1. If $v_1, v_2 \notin V$ then
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V\cup\{v_1\},z-|V|-3}(g) - s_{V\cup\{v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g) + s_{V\cup\{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|-4}(g) +$
$s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g) - 2s_{V\cup\{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V\cup\{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g)$
2. If $v_1 \in V, v_2 \notin V$ then
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = s_{V\setminus\{v_1\},z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{(V\setminus\{v_1\})\cup\{v_2\},z-|V|-2}(g) + s_{V\cup\{v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g) +$
$s_{V\setminus\{v_1\},z-|V|}(g) - 2s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V\cup\{v_2\},z-|V|-2}(g)$
3. If $v_2 \in V, v_1 \notin V$ then
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = s_{V\setminus\{v_2\},z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{(V\setminus\{v_2\})\cup\{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) + s_{V\cup\{v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g) -$
$s_{(V\setminus\{v_2\})\cup\{v_1\},z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g) - 2s_{V\cup\{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g)$
4. If $v_1, v_2 \in V$ then
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = s_{V\setminus\{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|}(g) - s_{V\setminus\{v_2\},z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V\setminus\{v_1\},z-|V|-1}(g) + s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) -$
$s_{V\setminus\{v_2\},z-|V|}(g) - s_{V\setminus\{v_1\},z-|V|}(g) - 2s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g)$

Proof. If $v_1, v_2 \notin V$ then
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = \sum_{A:|A|=z,V\cup\{v_1,v_2\}\subseteq A}\hat{g}_{eA} + \sum_{A:|A|=z,V\cup\{v_1\}\subseteq A,v_2\notin A}\hat{g}_{eA}$

$= \sum_{A:|A|=z, V \cup \{v_1,v_2\} \subseteq A} (\hat{g}_{A \setminus \{v_1,v_2\}} - \hat{g}_{A \setminus \{v_2\}} + \hat{g}_{A \setminus \{v_1\}}) + \sum_{A:|A|=z, V \cup \{v_1\} \subseteq A, v_2 \notin A} \hat{g}_{A \setminus \{v_1\}}$
$= \sum_{A:|A|=z-2, V \subseteq A, v_1,v_2 \notin A} \hat{g}_A - \sum_{A:|A|=z-1, V \cup \{v_1\} \subseteq A, v_2 \notin A} \hat{g}_A + \sum_{A:|A|=z-1, V \cup \{v_2\} \subseteq A, v_1 \notin A} \hat{g}_A +$
$\sum_{A:|A|=z-1, V \subseteq A, v_1,v_2 \notin A} \hat{g}_A =$
$(s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-3}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g) + s_{V \cup \{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|-4}(g)) -$
$(s_{V \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g) + s_{V \cup \{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g)) + (s_{V \cup \{v_2\},z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g)) +$
$(s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_2\},z-|V|-2}(g) + s_{V \cup \{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g)) =$
$s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-3}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g) + s_{V \cup \{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|-4}(g) + s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g)$
$- 2s_{V \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g)$
The case when $v_1 \in V, v_2 \notin V$ can be analyzed in the same way, yielding
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{(V \setminus \{v_1\}) \cup \{v_2\},z-|V|-2}(g) + s_{V \cup \{v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g) +$
$s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},z-|V|}(g) - 2s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_2\},z-|V|-2}(g)$
If $v_2 \in V, v_1 \notin V$ then
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = \sum_{A:|A|=z, V \cup \{v_1\} \subseteq A} \hat{g}_{eA} = \sum_{A:|A|=z, V \cup \{v_1\} \subseteq A} (\hat{g}_{A \setminus \{v_1,v_2\}} - \hat{g}_{A \setminus \{v_2\}} + \hat{g}_{A \setminus \{v_1\}})$
$= \sum_{A:|A|=z-2, V \setminus \{v_2\} \subseteq A, v_1,v_2 \notin A} \hat{g}_A - \sum_{A:|A|=z-1, (V \setminus \{v_2\}) \cup \{v_1\} \subseteq A, v_2 \notin A} \hat{g}_A + \sum_{A:|A|=z-1, V \subseteq A, v_1 \notin A} \hat{g}_A =$
$(s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{(V \setminus \{v_2\}) \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) + s_{V \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-3}(g)) -$
$(s_{(V \setminus \{v_2\}) \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-1}(g) + s_{V \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g)) + (s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g)) =$
$s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{(V \setminus \{v_2\}) \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g) - s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) + s_{V \cup \{v_2\},z-|V|-3}(g) - s_{(V \setminus \{v_2\}) \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-1}(g)$
$- s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g) - 2s_{V \cup \{v_1\},z-|V|-2}(g)$
The case when $v_1, v_2 \in V$ can be analyzed in a similar way, yielding
$s_{V,z-|V|}(g_e) = s_{V \setminus \{v_1,v_2\},z-|V|}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},z-|V|-1}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},z-|V|-1}(g) + s_{V,z-|V|-2}(g) -$
$s_{V \setminus \{v_2\},z-|V|}(g) - s_{V \setminus \{v_1\},z-|V|}(g) - 2s_{V,z-|V|-1}(g)$ ☐

Corollary B.6. *For all* $e_1, e_2 \in G$ *we have that*
$\max_{k \in [0,z]} \{\sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,z-k}(g_{e_1} - g_{e_2}))^2\} \leq 100 \max_{k \in [0,z], j \in 1,2} \{\sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,z-k-j}(g))^2\}$

Proof. This can be proved by using the above lemmas combined with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $(\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i)^2 \leq m \sum_{i=1}^{m} (x_i)^2$ and summing up over all of the possible V. ☐

Corollary B.7. *If* $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a base function for the input graph* G *with cutoff* z *and* e_1 *is an edge of* G*, then for any function* $f : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$*,*
$E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[\sum_{e_2 \in E(G)} (f \cdot \sigma(g_{e_1} - g_{e_2}))^2] \leq 2000 \frac{z^z}{n^{z-2}} ||f|| \max_{k \in [0,z], j \in \{1,2\}} \{\sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,z-k-j}(g))^2\}$

Proof. This follows immediately from Corollary B.6 and Corollary 3.21. ☐

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.23.

Proof of Theorem 3.23. It follows from Lemma 7.1 of Potechin [13] that if G' is a sound monotone switching network which accepts all of the input graphs $\{\sigma(G), \sigma \in S_{V(G)}\}$ then for any $\sigma \in S_{V(G)}$ and $e_1 \in E(G)$,
$\sum_{e_2 \in E(G)} \sum_{v' \in V(G')} |v' \cdot \sigma(g_{e_1} - g_{e_2})| \geq 1$
Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and letting $n' = |V(G')|$,
$1 \leq \sum_{e_2 \in E(G)} \sum_{v' \in V(G')} |v' \cdot \sigma(g_{e_1} - g_{e_2})| \leq (n^2)(n') \sum_{v' \in V(G')} \sum_{e_2 \in E(G)} (v' \cdot \sigma(g_{e_1} - g_{e_2}))^2$
This holds for any $\sigma \in S_{V(G)}$ so $(n^2)(n') \sum_{v' \in V(G')} E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[\sum_{e_2 \in E(G)} (v' \cdot \sigma(g_{e_1} - g_{e_2}))^2] \geq 1$
$(n^2)(n')^2 \max_{v' \in V(G')} \{E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[\sum_{e_2 \in E(G)} (v' \cdot \sigma(g_{e_1} - g_{e_2}))^2]\} \geq 1$

$$n' \geq \sqrt{\frac{1}{(n^2) \max_{v' \in V(G')} \{E_{\sigma \in S_{V(G)}}[\sum_{e_2 \in E(G)} (v' \cdot \sigma(g_{e_1} - g_{e_2}))^2]\}}}$$

For all $v' \in V(G')$, $||v'|| \leq 1$ so by Corollary B.7,

$$n' \geq \frac{n^{\frac{z}{2}-2}}{50 z^{\frac{z}{2}} \sqrt{\max_{k \in [0,z], j \in \{1,2\}} \{\sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,z-k-j}(g))^2\}}}$$ ☐

APPENDIX C. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.25

We recall the statement of Theorem 3.23 below.

Theorem 3.25. *If G is an input graph and z is an integer greater than 8 such that s and t are not 2^z-connected and for any vertex $v \in V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$ there are at most c vertices $w \in V(G) \cup \{s,t\}$ such that v and w are 2^z-connected then $m(G) \geq \frac{(\frac{n}{c})^{\frac{z}{4}}}{n^2 2^{4z^2}}$.*

Proof.

Proposition C.1. *For any set of vertices W such that no two distinct vertices of $W \cup \{s,t\}$ are 2^z-connected, there are at least $n - c(|W|+2)$ vertices v such that v is not 2^z connected to any vertex $w \in W \cup \{s,t\}$.*

Corollary C.2. *If $n \geq 2cz$ the algorithm for constructing g is guaranteed to succeed*

For the remainder of the proof we will assume that $n \geq c(z+1)^2 \geq 2cz$, which means that the algorithm for constructing g is thus guaranteed to succeed. We can do this because otherwise the lower bound given in Theorem 3.25 is ≤ 1 and is therefore trivial.

Definition C.3. *Define $m_{k,u} = \sum_{V:|V|=k} |s_{V,u}(g)|$*

Lemma C.4.
$m_{k,u} \leq (k2^k+1)(c(k+2)(m_{k-1,u} + m_{k-1,u-1}) + cnm_{k-2,u} + m_{k,u-1} + m_{k,u-2}) + 2^k m_{k-1,u+1}$

Proof. Consider how the values $t(V,u)$ are set and their contribution to $m_{k,u}$. Some $s_{V,u}(g)$ are fixed by Corollary 3.27. If so, there are three possibilities:
1. $s_{V,u}(g) = -s_{V\backslash\{v\},u}(g) + s_{V,u-1}(g)$ and s and v are $2^{z-|V|-u-1}$-connected for some $v \in V$.
2. $s_{V,u}(g) = s_{V\backslash\{v\},u}(g) - s_{V,u-1}(g)$ and v and t are $2^{z-|V|-u-1}$-connected for some $v \in V$.
3. $s_{V,u}(g) = s_{V\backslash\{v_1\},u}(g) - s_{V\backslash\{v_2\},u}(g) + s_{V\backslash\{v_1,v_2\},u}(g) - s_{V\backslash\{v_1\},u-1}(g) - s_{V\backslash\{v_2\},u-1}(g) + s_{V,u-2}(g)$ and there is a path of length at most $2^{z-|V|-u-1}$ from v_1 to v_2 for some $v_1, v_2 \in V$
Note that for each U, there are at most $2c$ different V such that case 1 or 2 holds and $U = V\backslash\{v\}$. This gives a contribution of at most $2cm_{k-1,u}$. Similarly, for each U there are at most ck different V such that case 3 holds and $U = V\backslash\{v_1\}$ or $U = V\backslash\{v_2\}$. This gives a contribution of at most $ck(m_{k-1,u} + m_{k-1,u-1})$. Finally, for each U there are at most cn different V such that case 3 holds and $U = V\backslash\{v_1,v_2\}$. This gives a contribution of at most $cnm_{k-2,u}$.
For each V, the contribution to $|s_{V,u}(g)|$ from itself is at most $|s_{V,u-1}(g)| + |s_{V,u-1}(g)|$. Thus the total contribution from terms fixed by Corollary 3.27 is at most
$c(k+2)(m_{k-1,u} + m_{k-1,u-1}) + cnm_{k-2,u} + m_{k,u-1} + m_{k,u-2}$
The values of $t(V,u)$ which are not determined by Corollary 3.27 are chosen when we use Lemma 3.28 to ensure that $a(U,u+1) = t(U,u+1)$ for all U of size $k-1$. These adjustments give a direct contribution of at most $2^k m_{k-1,u+1}$. However, we also need to correct for the errors introduced by the terms $t(V,u)$ fixed by Corollary 3.27. Each such term $t(V,u)$ can affect $a(U,u+1)$ for at most k such U, so the total adjustment needed is at most $k2^k(c(k+2)(m_{k-1,u} + m_{k-1,u-1}) + cnm_{k-2,u} + m_{k,u-1} + m_{k,u-2})$
Adding everything together gives
$(k2^k+1)(c(k+2)(m_{k-1,u} + m_{k-1,u-1}) + cnm_{k-2,u} + m_{k,u-1} + m_{k,u-2}) + 2^k m_{k-1,u+1}$. □

Corollary C.5. $m_{k,u} \leq (cn)^{\frac{k+u}{2}} 16^{(k+u)k}$

Proof. This can be proved using induction, Lemma C.4, and the assumption that $n \geq c(z+1)^2$. □

Corollary C.6. *If we have an upper bound b for $\max_{V,u}\{|s_{V,u}(g)|\}$ then*
$\forall k, u, \sum_{A:|A|=k} (s_{A,u}(g))^2 \leq bm_{k,u} \leq (cn)^{\frac{k+u}{2}} 16^{(k+u)k} \leq b(cn)^{\frac{z}{2}} 16^{(z^2)}$

Corollary C.7. *Under the above hypotheses, $m(G) \geq (\frac{n}{c})^{\frac{z}{4}} \frac{1}{50(n^2)(z^{\frac{z}{2}})4^{(z^2)}\sqrt{b}}$*

Proof. By Theorem 3.23,
$m(G) \geq \frac{1}{50(n^2)} \sqrt{(\frac{n^z}{z^z b(cn)^{\frac{z}{2}} 16^{(z^2)}})} = (\frac{n}{c})^{\frac{z}{4}} \frac{1}{50(n^2)(z^{\frac{z}{2}})4^{(z^2)}\sqrt{b}}$ ☐

Now we just need to bound b.

Definition C.8. *Define* $b_{k,u} = \max_{V:|V|=k} \{|s_{V,u}(g)|\}$

Lemma C.9. $b_{k+1,u-1} \leq 4^{k+u+1}$

Proof. We use the same technique used to prove Lemma C.4.
Let U be a set of vertices of size $k+1$. If $s_{U,u-1}(g)$ is determined by Corollary 3.27 then
$|s_{U,u-1}(g)| \leq 2b_{k,u-1} + b_{k-1,u-1} + 2b_{k,u-2} + b_{k+1,u-2} + b_{k+1,u-3}$.
If not, then no two distinct vertices of $U \cup \{s,t\}$ are $2^{z-k-u-1}$-connected. Now note that there are at most $\binom{k+1}{j}\binom{n}{j-1}$ possible V of size k which would cause an adjustment of $(-1)^{j+1}(\frac{1}{j\binom{k+1}{j}})s_{V,u}(g)$ in $s_{U,u-1}(g)$ if we used Lemma 3.28 with W such that $U \subseteq V \cup W$ and there are at most $\frac{n^{k+1-j}}{(k+1-j)!}$ such W. However, since $2c(z+1) < \frac{n}{2}$, for each V there are at least $\frac{1}{(k+1)!}(\frac{n}{2})^{k+1}$ possible choices for W and we split up the adjustments evenly among all of them. Thus, the contribution to $|s_{U,u-1}(g)|$ from each V for this j is at most $(k+1)!(\frac{2}{n})^{k+1}\frac{n^{k+1-j}}{(k+1-j)!}(\frac{1}{j\binom{k+1}{j}})s_{V,u}(g)$, so the total contribution for this j is at most

$\binom{k+1}{j}\frac{n^{j-1}}{(j-1)!}(k+1)!(\frac{2}{n})^{k+1}\frac{n^{k+1-j}}{(k+1-j)!}(\frac{1}{j\binom{k+1}{j}})b_{V,u} = \frac{\binom{k+1}{j}2^{k+1}}{n}b_{V,u}$
Summing over all j, the total contribution is at most $\frac{4^{k+1}}{n}b_{V,u}$
Again, we also need to account for the adjustments made to counteract the terms $s_{U,u-1}(g)$ determined by Corollary 3.27. To do this, note that each V will be affected by at most $c(k+2)$ such terms and these contribute in the same way as $s_{V,u}(g)$. Thus if $s_{U,u-1}(g)$ is not determined by Corollary 3.27 then
$|s_{U,u-1}(g)| \leq \frac{4^{k+1}}{n}(b_{V,u} + ck(2b_{k,u-1} + b_{k-1,u-1} + 2b_{k,u-2} + b_{k+1,u-2} + b_{k+1,u-3}))$
Now note that $n \geq 2cz4^{z+1}$ as otherwise the lower bound in Theorem 3.25 is trivial. Using induction, we can show that $b_{k+1,u-1} \leq 4^{k+u}$, as needed. ☐

This lemma gives the bound that $b \leq 4^z$. Theorem 3.25 now follows easily by Corollary C.7. ☐